

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Official Action of January 10, 2005.
Reexamination and reconsideration re respectfully requested.

Priority Acknowledgement

It is noted that the initial Action acknowledges receipt of the certified copy in support of the claim for priority under 35 USC 119.

Drawings

It is noted that the drawings as filed on December 3, 2003 are accepted.

Information Disclosure Statement

An information disclosure statement under separate cover accompanies this submission to provide the patent documents identified as Patent Document 1, Patent Document 2, and Patent Document 3 at pages 1 and 2 of the specification as filed. These documents are discussed at pages 1 to 3 of the specification as filed. It should be noted that Patent Document 3 should be 2000-11407 and correction to that effect is made to the substitute specification. That submission is accompanied by a request for a payment of a fee for consideration of those documents.

Claims

Claims 1 to 10 were initially rejected as anticipated by the patent to Usui, No. 6,400,902 for the reasons stated at pages 2 and 3 of the Action. This position is respectfully traversed.

It should first be noted that Usui is the type of system mentioned at the top of page 3 of the specification where it is indicated that a flat-wound coil is widely used as a tracking coil that produces a minute movement of an object employed for an optical disk and is not suited as a driver that requires a long-strong movement such as a zooming operation of a lens tube. In Usui's arrangement, the coil is mounted transversely to the defined optical axis and

is not shaped as in the Applicant's invention.. According, claim 1 is clarified to indicate that the body moves along an optical axis of a lens" and that a guiding axis is provided for among other things "allowing the body to move freely in a direction of the optical axis of the lens without turning". Support for the limitations on the function of the guiding axis are found, for example, at page 5, lines 2 to 17 among other places. At the very least, this feature as stated distinguishes the claimed invention from Usui that uses a plurality of coils as X-axis and Y-axis corrections for overcoming blur that operate in pairs. No longitudinal movement along the optical axis of the lens by the body is taught or suggested by Usui. To the limited extent that some movement occurs in Usui, it falls short of meeting the limitation of moving "freely in a direction of the optical axis".

Moreover, amended claim 1 clarifies that the driving coil that is flatly wound provides a thrust along the optical axis for movement of the body along the optical axis, a distinction over Usui. The coils in Usui do not provide longitudinal moving of a freely movable body along the optical axis; rather, the coils cooperate for orthogonal blur correction.

While it may be argued, we suppose, that the driving coil 13a to 13d is flatly wound, a look at Fig. 2 of Usui in contrast to Figs. 3 and 4 of the instant application shows that the Usui operation differs from that claimed in that there is no movement along the optical axis of the lens in Usui other than incidental adjusting movement. The movement relied upon by the examiner by referring to col. 5, lines 62 to 67, shows that the movement of the ring magnet and the drive coils is limited so that the ring magnet 31 becomes fixed to the yoke 32 to form a magnetic circuit. It is thus submitted that the language of amended claim 1 distinguishes the physical structure and movement characteristics of the instant invention as claimed from the fair teachings of Usui.

Furthermore, the claimed action of the driving coils in providing a thrust on the body along the optical axis of the lens differs from that of Usui in that in Usui the movement is limited only to moving the ring magnet to the yoke to form a magnetic circuit. That thrust is solely in the context of Fig. 2, for example, where the body 12 is limited by a short movement that hardly can be characterized as freely moving along the optical axis. Bear in

mind that Fig. 2 is an exploded perspective view for use as shown in Fig. 1 in block form. Usui is thus not usable for zooming, as discussed in the instant specification.

Claims 11 to 20 are new, with claims 11 to 16 paralleling claims 1 to 5 with additional guiding structure as discussed primarily at pages 5 and 6 of the specification. Claims 17 to 20 are in means plus function format, endorsed by 35 USC 112 with the combination of the guiding means, driving means, and magnetic members performing the stated functions.

Conclusion

Claims 1 to 20 are submitted to be in condition for allowance and free from the stated anticipation rejection of original claims 1 to 10 for the reasons stated above.

Dated: March 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant